DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 654 HE 017 422

AUTHOR Chia, Rosina C.; Bolen, Larry M.
TITLE A Comparison of Participants in Two Academic Administration Training Programs.
PUB DATE Aug 83
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrators; *College Administration; *Fellowships; Higher Education; Locus of Control; *Management Development; Participant Characteristics; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS *American Council on Education; *Harvard University MA

ABSTRACT

Participants in the American Council on Education (ACE) Fellows program and Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management (IEM) were compared on demographic characteristics, locus of control, and degree of satisfaction with the program. Thirty-two participants from the ACE program and 82 IEM participants were studied. Levenson's Internality, Powerful Others, Chance Scale was administered to participants to measure locus of control. It was found that participants in IEM were older and had been in administration longer. ACE Fellows were younger and more were faculty members. Those who were administrators had less experience in administration compared to the IEM participants. Participants of the two groups were similar in their academic background and shared similar beliefs on the locus of control scales. Both groups were highly satisfied with their individual programs. While externality was associated with higher satisfaction for both groups, the externality was in different domains. In addition, powerful others were more significant for younger ACE Fellows than for older IEM participants. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245654

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry M. Bolen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Comparison of Participants in Two Academic Administration Training Programs

Rosina C. Chia and Larry M. Bolen

East Carolina University

HE017422

A Comparison of Participants in Two Academic Administration Training Programs

Abstract

Participants in the American Council on Education Fellows program and Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management were compared on their demographic characteristics, locus of control, and degree of satisfaction with the program. Results are presented in tabular form and differences are discussed.

Statement of the Problem

The American Council on Education (ACE) is a private, non-profit coordinating organization consisting of approximately 1,500 post-secondary educational institutions. It is the major representative organization for higher education. One of the ACE's most recognized programs is the ACE Fellows Program, which began in 1965. Each year ACE selects faculty or junior staff who have demonstrated administrative potential and provides a year-long internship in which participants work closely with the chief executive officer of an institution.

Harvard University's Institute for Educational Management (IEM) has a similar mission as the ACE Fellows Program. Its stated goal is to offer an opportunity for senior-level college and university administrators to develop and enhance their skills in effective leadership and management. It started in 1970 and draws from a similar post-secondary population as that of the ACE. The structure of the programs is also similar. ACE has 3 week-long seminars and a year's intern placement with a mentor on campus. IEM has an intense 4-week management development program, but no internship. This study compares the two groups' demographic characteristics, locus of control, and the degree of satisfaction with each program.

Subjects

Subjects include all participants of the 1981-82 ACE Fellows Program and the 1982 IEM Program. An institution nominates a candidate, then ACE and IEM select their finalists through a national competition review process. The actual participants who responded to our survey numbered 32 (76% return rate) for ACE, and 82 (79%) for IEM.

Procedure

At the first ACE seminar in September, 1981, a short survey consisting of demographic information (age, sex, faculty or administrator, academic discipline of degree, etc.), and a measurement of locus of control (Levenson's Internality, Powerful Others, Chance Scale, 1974) was distributed to each participant. Levenson's scale consists of 3 subscales using a Likert format ranging from strongly agree (+3) to strongly disagree (-3). The three subscales measure the degree of control the respondent feels the following factors have over one's life: one's own behavior; powerful others; and chance. Each I, P, and C scale has a range of -24 to +24. Internality is scored in the internal direction; P and C are scored in the external direction. The completed survey form was to be returned to the ACE Office. At the final ACE seminar in May, 1982, another survey, consisting of the IPC Scale and some questions concerning satisfaction with the year's experience, was again distributed and asked to be returned. IEM held its program in the summer of 1982. A survey including demographic information, IPC Scale, and satisfaction questions was mailed to each participant shortly after the end of the program in August, 1982. The data for this study are based on these

returned surveys.

Results

I. Comparison of Demographic Data

The total N was 32 for ACE and 82 for IEM. Since some respondents omitted some questions, all percentages were based on the adjusted N consisting of only those who answered that question.

		ACE		IEM
Position:	Faculty	30.8%	Faculty	3.7%
	Administrators	26.9%	Staff Members in Adm.	18.3%
	Faculty/Admin.	42.3%	Deans, Directors, etc.	41.5%
			Provosts, VP's, etc.	26.7%
			Presidents, Chancellors	9.8%
Academic Discipline:				
	Soc. Science & Language	23.1%		24.4%
	Humanities & Art	23.1%		19.5%
	Natural Science	7.7%		9.8%
	Administration	7.7%		12.2%
	Education	34.6%		34.1%
	Other	3.8%		0
Sex:	Male	54.8%		76.6%
	Female	45.2%		23.4%
Race:	White	73.8%		84.1%
	Black	21.4%		9.3%
	Other	4.8%		6.6%

	ACE	IEM
Age:	Range, 31-44 yrs., Mean = 38.6	Range, 30-63 yrs., Mean = 43.5
Years of Experience as Faculty:	Range, 6-20 yrs., Mean = 10.6	Range, 0-25 yrs., Mean = 8.17
Years of Experience as Administrator:	Range, 0-15 yrs., Mean = 4.6	Range, 0-31 yrs., Mean = 8.65

The results suggest that there are some basic differences in the participants of the two programs. ACE has 31% faculty members, while IEM has only 4% faculty. Participants in IEM are significantly older ($t = 3.48$, $p < .01$) has more years of experience as administrators ($t = 3.2$, $p < .01$) but less years of experience as faculty ($t = 2.01$, $p < .05$). There does not seem to be much difference in the academic disciplines of the participants. IEM tends to have a higher percentage of males and whites, this may very likely be due to the fact that there are more whites and males at senior-level positions, therefore, IEM is more limited in its selection of females and minorities.

II. Locus of Control

		ACE		IEM	
		$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
	I	14.6	4.7	13.2	5.8
Overall	P	-5.5	6.0	-6.6	7.2
	C	-10.7	6.4	-11.9	6.7
	I	13.0	6.1	13.3	6.1
Male	P	-8.1	5.3	-7.4	7.0
	C	-14.5	5.3	-10.9	7.0

	ACE		IEM	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
I	15.8	5.5	13.0	4.5
Female P	-6.3	7.3	-3.6	7.5
C	-11.4	4.6	-10.6	5.8

Within the ACE group and the IEM group, all t's comparing I, P, and C did not reach statistical significance. Similarly, when we compared ACE and IEM within I, P, and C; there was no significant difference. Clearly the two groups have highly similar beliefs in locus of control.

III. Satisfaction with Training Program

A. Overall Satisfaction

ACE		IEM			
$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	p
1.70	.95	1.65	.59	.33	NS

On a scale ranging from 1(very satisfied) to 5, the overall satisfaction with both programs was very positive, and there was no significant difference between the degree of satisfaction for the two groups.

B. Relationship Between I, P, & C and Satisfaction

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients between I, P, & C and satisfaction with each program are presented below.

	ACE		IEM		Difference	
	r	p	r	p	Between r's	p
I	-.18	NS	.23	.02	1.89	NS
P	-.41	.01	.06	NS	2.14	.03
C	.18	NS	.03	NS	.68	NS

For the ACE group, the more one felt powerful others have control, the higher the satisfaction with the program. For the IEM group, the less

one felt the self has control, the higher the satisfaction with the program. These findings are consistent, i.e., both suggest that higher externality was associated with higher satisfaction.

When we examined the difference in r's for the two groups, the only significant pairs of r concern P. There was no relationship between P and satisfaction for participants in the IEM program, but there was a strong negative relationship for the ACE Fellows. One reason could be that the ACE Fellows were younger and less experienced, thus the perception of how much control powerful others have may play a far more important role in their perception of other events, including the feeling of satisfaction with the ACE program.

Conclusions

The results show that the participants in IEM were older and have been in administration longer. ACE Fellows were younger and more of them were faculty, and those who were administrators had less experience in administration. Participants of the two groups were quite similar in their academic background. They also shared very similar beliefs on I, P, and C. Both groups were highly satisfied with their individual programs. An interesting difference was the relationship between locus of control and satisfaction of program. While externality was associated with higher satisfaction for both groups, the externality was in different domains. It may be that ACE Fellows realized they were "junior" members, that academic administration was far more complex than expected, that they needed powerful others to help them, and the ACE program had offered skills to deal with powerful others, thus leading to a higher satisfaction with the

program. On the other hand, IEM participants were already familiar with the complexities of administration; those who felt they had strong internal control felt they've learned less from the program, leading to lower satisfaction about the program. The other interesting result was that powerful others were more significant for younger ACE Fellows than for older IEM participants. Maybe many IEM participants already had the feeling that they were the powerful others.

These preliminary data have pointed out some interesting trends. A longitudinal study of future classes of ACE and IEM to gather more information on our future leaders of higher education is suggested.